## 

1 2 3	Norman J. Blears (SBN 95600) nblears@sidley.com SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 1001 Page Mill Road, Building 1 Palo Alto, California 94304 Telephone: (650) 565-7000				
5 6	Robin E. Wechkin (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) rwechkin@sidley.com SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4200				
7	Seattle, Washington Telephone: (206) 262-7680				
8	Counsel for Defendants				
9					
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
13					
14	MARY JANE JASIN and THOMAS JASIN,	Case No.: 5:14-CV-03263 BLF			
15	Plaintiffs,	) ) CTIDIII ATION AND IDDODOSEDI			
16	vs.	) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ) ORDER REGARDING RESPONSE TO ) SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT			
17 18	VIVUS, INC., LELAND F. WILSON, TIMOTHY MORRIS, and PETER Y. TAM	) SECOND AMENDED COMI LAINI )			
19	Defendants.	) )			
20		,			
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	ĺ	

26

27

28

#### **STIPULATION**

#### **WHEREAS:**

- 1. On June 18, 2015, this Court issued an order granting defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiffs' first amended complaint and granting plaintiffs leave to file a second amended complaint by August 14, 2015. (Docket No. 30)
- Plaintiffs accordingly filed their second amended complaint on August 14, 2015.
   (Docket No. 32)
- 3. Defendants expect that they will respond to the second amended complaint by again moving to dismiss.
- 4. The briefing on defendants' motion to dismiss may be complex. The parties wish to ensure that they have sufficient time to brief the issues in a way that will provide optimal assistance to the Court.

### THE PARTIES THEREFORE STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

- Defendants' response to the second amended complaint should be filed on or before
   October 2, 2015.
- 2. In the event that defendants' response is a motion to dismiss, plaintiffs' opposition to that motion should be filed on or before November 20, 2015, and defendants' reply in support of the motion should be filed on or before December 15, 2015.

1

# 

1	3. A hearing on defendants' motion to dismiss the second amended complaint should be scheduled at the Court's direction, and on a date of the Court's choosing after January 1, 2016.		
2			
3			
4	Dated: August 24, 2015	By: s/ Norman J. Blears	
5		Norman J. Blears	
6		SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP	
7		Counsel for Defendants	
8			
9	Dated: August 24, 2015	By: s/ Rosemary M. Rivas	
10		Rosemary M. Rivas	
11		Finkelstein Thompson LLP 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94111	
12		San Francisco, ČA 94111 Telephone: (415) 398-8700	
13		L. Kendall Satterfield	
14		Michael G. McClellan Rosalee B.C. Thomas	
15		Finkelstein Thompson LLP 1077 30 <sup>th</sup> St NW, Suite 150	
16		Washington, D.C. 20007 Telephone: (202) 337-8000	
17		Counsel for Plaintiffs	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		2	

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER		
2	Pursuant to the parties' stipulation above, the Court orders as follows:		
3	1. Defendants' response to plaintiffs' second amended complaint is due October 2,		
4	2015.		
5	2. In the event defendants respond to the second amended complaint moving to dismiss,		
6	plaintiffs' opposition to that motion is due November 20, 2015 and defendants' reply is due		
7	December 15, 2015.		
8	3. Defendants shall reserve a hearing date on any motion to dismiss pursuant to the		
9	procedures set forth in the Court's standing order.		
10			
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
12	John Jaly hoenan		
13	Dated: August 25, 2015  HON. BETH LABSON FREEMAN United States District Judge		
14			
15			
16			
17   18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	3		